

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D.C., July 20, 1950

The first meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1951, was held at its Office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, July 20, 1950. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Acting Chairman,
Prof. Murphy,
Prof. Hudnut,
Mr. Neild,
Mr. Belluschi,
Mr. deWeldon,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary
and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Finley welcomed into the fellowship of the Commission Prof. Hudnut, Mr. Neild, Mr. Belluschi, and Mr. deWeldon, who were recently appointed by the President. Mr. Finley said:

"As an older member of the Commission, I am delighted to welcome you and I think you will find, as all of us do, that it is really one of the most satisfactory services one can render the country. There are many pleasant things about it but, as with all worthwhile jobs, there are also headaches. However, taking the good with the bad, it is one of the best and most interesting opportunities a man can have to render useful and constructive service to the country. I am sure you will find it so. The first order of business is the election of a chairman."

1. ELECTION OF A CHAIRMAN: Upon the motion of Prof. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Neild, Mr. Finley was unanimously elected Chairman of the Commission. Mr. Finley expressed his appreciation of the appointment, though as he said he had not sought it. However, he said also "I shall certainly do my best."

The Secretary stated that it is a fine thing to have the Chairman of the Commission in Washington because the Commission does have important

matters come before it which, at times, require immediate contact with the Chairman.

2. VACATION GRANTED TO THE SECRETARY: Mr. Caemmerer stated that this has been a hard year for him, helping the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission in connection with several of their projects, in addition to his duties as Secretary of the Commission, and that he would consider it a real favor if the Commission would grant him leave of absence from the early part of December to the latter part of January, 1951, for a visit to South America.

The Commission granted the request.

3. BUDGET AND ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR THE COMMISSION: Chairman Finley stated that anyone coming to the Commission for the first time would be surprised to find the tremendous amount of work done by the small staff in Washington. The staff has consisted at times of only Mr. Caemmerer, writing the letters and doing all the clerical work as well.

Mr. Caemmerer stated that he now has a clerk-typist to help him regularly, and Mrs. Reed has been helping as a part time secretary in connection with the Sesquicentennial projects. Mr. Caemmerer stated further

"I mention it now because I believe the Congress is about to pass a special law to take care of 'Old Georgetown.' Mr. Neild mentioned that in connection with New Orleans, Louisiana. In Charleston, South Carolina, there is an Ordinance to protect historic sites and buildings; also in Alexandria, Virginia."

"Each member of the Commission has a copy of the Bill (H. R. 7670) in his portfolio. It provides that the Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia Government shall submit designs received at his office, concerning construction of new buildings, and changing old buildings, to the Commission of Fine Arts. Then, if the Bill becomes law, the Commission would have power to appoint three architects who serve as a Board of Advisers, and they must report, in writing to the Commission of Fine Arts, before this Commission reports back to the Director of Inspection." (Exhibit A) The area involved was indicated on a District of Columbia Highway Map.

"All this will make some additional clerical help necessary, I am certain. I have thought the Commission could consider this matter at the next meeting of the Commission, perhaps about the middle of September."

"It is also necessary to consider a revised budget because of additional funds now needed for travel expenses."

The Commission considered the question of appointing a committee of three architects and decided to take up this matter with the American Institute of Architects when the legislation has been enacted into law.

4. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: Chairman Finley asked if the Commission would wish to meet in the middle of September.

Mr. Neild stated that he would regret missing a meeting of the Commission, but that he and his son have planned to sail for Europe the middle of August and will not return until October 4th.

Mr. Finley suggested meeting the day after Mr. Neild returns to New York. The other members of the Commission concurred.

5. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: The Secretary submitted the following sets of designs for private structures coming within the Shipstead-Luce Act area:

(a) Commercial Building at Sixth Street and Indiana Avenue, N. W. Design by George T. Santmeyer, architect, submitted by the Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia on June 21, 1950; Application No. 1349.

The Secretary explained the Shipstead-Luce Act, outlined the area comprised in the Act, as indicated on a Zoning Map, and stated that since the enactment of the law on May 16, 1930, there have been nearly 1400 formal submissions. The Commission advises on the appearance of the building, including height and material.

This design is for a commercial building on lots A, B, C, and D, at Indiana Avenue and D Street, N. W., with its east elevation fronting on

Sixth Street, up a ways from the National Gallery of Art. It is to be six stories high, faced with limestone; there will be stores on the first floor and the rest will be offices.

Mr. Murphy said, "I have seen the design and it seems that inasmuch as it is to be in limestone, conforming generally with the plan followed in such buildings, and it is so plain, there is very little to be said about it. One question I have in mind is the projecting sills and the architect explained them to me."

Mr. Finley said, "I am interested in this building, because I see it as I come out of the front door of the National Gallery of Art. It seems to me that ~~it~~ is a good functional building and the design is all right."

Mr. Belluschi said, "What good would it do to make comments on this. It seems to me that in a few years the design will be dated. I do not think it is functional either to put these two columns (indicating) in here because if you want to put a partition anywhere else, you will have it in the middle of the room; but the design is not too offensive.

Thereupon, on motion, properly moved and seconded, the Commission approve the design. The Director of Inspection was informed accordingly.

(b) Design for International Teamsters Headquarters Building, facing Union Station Plaza, fronting on Louisiana Avenue, adjacent to the Continental Hotel.

The Secretary stated that a few days ago representatives of the firm of Holabird, Root and Burgee, 180 Wabash Avenue, Chicago (Messrs. A. J. Long, C. J. Pacer and Thomas Lalish), called and presented this design for a Headquarters Building of the International Teamsters Union, to face Union Station Plaza. As to height it will not exceed 80 feet, in accordance with the Height of Buildings Law of 1910. It is to be faced with marble. The main entrance is on Louisiana Avenue, where there is to be a lobby, leading to an auditorium, with offices overhead. The Secretary stated further that

he arranged to have the design brought to the attention of Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Murphy said, "They dropped in to see me for a moment. They seem to think this design works out to suit the interests of the plan and also to suit their clients. The sort of projection on the Louisiana front is out of scale with the rest of the building."

Mr. Hudnut said, "With respect to Holabird, Root and Burgee, this is a terrible building. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the architects be requested to restudy these plans, and that they confer with Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Murphy said, "I would like to be able to fortify myself with points to bring up to them. I think this is definitely one question that might be raised, as Mr. Belluschi mentioned, the scale the so-called projection imposes on it."

Mr. Hudnut commented by saying, "I would say there is an element of fake about it. It is just as much of a fake as though he pressed it on another model."

Chairman Finley said that was true, and asked if the Commission could say that we like the D Street facade better. Mr. Murphy replied, "That would be one way to approach it."

Thereupon, on motion properly moved and seconded, the motion of Mr. Hudnut as above stated, was adopted. The firm was notified accordingly (Exhibit B).

(c) Apartment Building at 25th and E Streets, N. W.:

Under date of July 17, 1950, the following letter was received from the Kass Realty Company, with designs and perspective for an apartment building at 25th and E Streets, N. W.:

KASS REALTY COMPANY, INC.
4461 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Washington 8, D. C.

Garfield I. Kass
President

Emerson 8100
July 17, 1950

Fine Arts Commission
Room 7000
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

Attention: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith are two sets of blueprints and rendered prospective for proposed apartment building at 25th and E Streets, N. W., and request that this be given consideration at the Commission's meeting on July 20, 1950.

In accordance with your suggestion, Mr. Brock of my office, contacted Mr. A. S. Thorne, Supervising Architect, to ascertain any proposed development at this time that his office might have for this property.

Mr. Thorne advised that at the present time there are no public funds available for the development of this particular area, nor are there any Acts or any Bills pending in Congress for the appropriation of any monies to purchase ground in this immediate vicinity and no immediate prospects of any such action being taken.

I, therefore, request that the design as submitted be approved by the Commission in order that we may proceed with the construction of this building.

Very truly yours,
Sgd.

GIK:GSB:ls

Garfield I. Kass.

The Secretary said: "About ten years ago President Franklin D. Roosevelt planned for a great Navy Department at this location, with an historic ship basin at the water-front. Nothing final has developed, though the Public Buildings Administration has been negotiating for the purchase of land at the Brewery site nearby. Since the Government has not proceeded with the construction of a Navy Department Building, The Kass

Realty Company feels justified in going ahead with their project. However, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is also interested in the location and for that reason I sent the following Memorandum to Mr. John Nolen, their Director of Planning:

'Here is a set of drawings for an apartment building at 25th and E Streets, N.W. The Kass Realty Company has reported that the Public Buildings Administration has advised them that 'There are no public funds available for the development of this particular area, nor are there any Acts or Bills pending in Congress for the appropriation of any moneys to purchase ground in this immediate vicinity, and no immediate prospects of any such action being taken.' Hence the Kass Realty Company feels justified in going ahead with the project. Does your Commission concur? Please let me have a preliminary report by Thursday, July 20, when the Commission of Fine Arts will meet.'

Mr. Nolen submitted the following preliminary report:

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK
AND PLANNING COMMISSION
Washington

July 20, 1950

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary
Commission of Fine Arts

Subject: Proposed apartment building
at 25th and E Streets, N. W.

You asked whether the Commission would concur in the proposed construction by the Kass Realty Company of a 6-story apartment building on Lots 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, Square 33, at 25th and E Streets, N.W., involving 188 apartments.

This location is well within the taking lines for the completion of the Northwest Rectangle and is situated in a square in which a large proportion of the property is already vacant. Hence, it would not only add materially to the eventual cost of acquisition if the apartment building were allowed to proceed, but would also mitigate seriously against carrying out any development on the balance of the square.

As this proposal involves a more important question of basic policy, I should like to present the matter to the Planning Commission at its meeting on August 2-4 for

specific recommendation. Can you withhold your report until after that meeting?

Signed
John Wolen, Jr.
Director of Planning

Atts.
1 set of plans

Mr. Neild asked about the material to be used and the character of the neighborhood.

The Secretary replied that the plans indicate that it is proposed to use brick, and as to the character of the neighborhood there are largely old shacks and storage buildings, with the brewery not far away. Along the river front is the Rock Creek Parkway.

Mr. deWeldon said that the Bureau of Yards and Docks have a complete set of drawings for a proposed Navy building on that site.

Mr. Belluschi said, "My feeling is that the possibility of using a space which might be needed later on is a more important point to consider than the design. I think the design is not offensive but if the ground may be later given over to Government facilities, it would be a serious mistake to build the apartment there now.

Mr. Hudnut asked, "Would it be proper to move that this Commission will not consider the approval or disapproval of a design until the question of the site development has been determined? I think they will have to wait. I think it would be a great pity to fill up that area with buildings of this type."

Chairman Finley agreed that it would be wise to wait until a report is received from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission concerning the site. Upon a motion properly moved and seconded the Commission so decided. Accordingly, the Secretary referred the plans and

perspective to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission with a Memorandum (Exhibit C).

(d) Commercial Building at Virginia Avenue and 21st Street:

The Secretary presented the design for this building, by the Kass Realty Company. It will be about opposite the State Department Building.

Mr. Hudnut felt that it is an unimportant building that could be knocked down quickly.

Attention was called to a chimney shown in the blueprints, but covered by a tree in the perspective. The Secretary remarked that doubtless the tree is there, but it would be an ugly looking thing if the tree should die.

Mr. Murphy said the Kass Realty Company do their own designing. Commenting on the design, Mr. Murphy said that it is the sort of thing they do right along. It is average production. If there were some way to raise the level of that work it would be wonderful, because there is so much of it.

Mr. Belluschi said in considering the design:

"I do not get to Washington very often, but I was under the impression that Washington was very conservative and that their buildings were of conservative design. I see all of these designs are of the modern type of which one gets very tired, very soon. It seems to me to be a wrong step. We are all for contemporary modern architecture but not in the wrong direction, it seems to me. These are not offensive designs but they are just enough wrong to make them a little offensive to me."

Mr. Neild said:

"I believe this Commission should set out what we would like to have done in the way of buildings. I believe there is too much of this type of design which is before us. We are going to have occasions when we will have buildings of this type near fine buildings. Therefore, I think we should have a policy.

Chairman Finley asked "I wonder if there is anything we can do through the local Chapter?"

Mr. Hudnut said "Isn't there a question of supporting the architectural profession when we have a design like this. Is this man a member of the Institute?"

Mr. Murphy replied:

"Yes, he is a member of the Institute. Nearly all of the younger men have turned toward this type of expression. They feel it is far enough afield from anything that has been done to be pretty good, and be different. It is a test. If it is a little bit sensational, that is better. Of course we do not permit them to be very sensational so it generally winds up in their putting drafts on the table that are not very good. However, they are much more numerous now and much more vociferous in the Chapter than the older, more conservative fellows who prefer to think about it a little bit, you know. I suppose that applies to practically every Chapter. I imagine we represent a cross-section of what is going on in America. I would not know that but I should think so.

"One man has an idea of making a building entirely of glass. Others have lined up with the park interests. While still others want to make things out of metal. They seem to be material minded. They do not talk about proportions or scale or architectural plan, or mass; it is a question whether or not you subscribe to glass, metal or plastics. The antagonism among those groups is very bitter."

Upon motion of Mr. Hudnut, seconded by Mr. Neild, the Commission disapproved the design (Exhibit D).

6. ADVERTISING SIGN FOR "JOHNSON'S RESTAURANT", 27th STREET and ROCK CREEK PARKWAY: Mr. L. L. Hunter, Assistant Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Services, General Services Administration, appeared before the Commission, and said:

"Gentlemen, I hate to take your time with this very small matter. We were before this Commission at their meeting in May with regard to converting a place known as "The Stables" to a Howard Johnson Restaurant. It is Government-owned property leased to Howard Johnson. The design was approved, excepting the sign, which we were told could not exceed 25 square feet, in accordance with a regulation of this Commission pertaining to the Shipstead-Luce Act. We asked the Howard Johnson people to resubmit the sign. I have some drawings from their architects showing the sign. It is proposed to put the sign at the corner of 27th Street and the Parkway where it can be seen from both directions. It is a "trade-mark" sign to be

in porcelain enamel, double face, not to exceed 25 square feet, each face. That 25 square-foot sign does not include the pedestal upon which it stands.

"Regarding colors of the sign, they propose to use green and 'rose pink'. I understand the restrictions on red are due to the traffic conditions, so it will not be confused with traffic lights.

Mr. Hunter pointed out that the Howard Johnson people propose to remove a sign over the entrance.

Mr. deWeldon said, "I would suggest they have a sign similar to the type of sign they have in Williamsburg. It is a sign that is not offensive and still tells the story."

Chairman Finley agreed that that would be very much better.

Mr. Hudnut asked, "Would it be proper for us to approve a sign above the cornice and disapprove this?"

Mr. Hunter replied that the sign over the corner was omitted at the last meeting of the Commission, since it was considered to be in the category of a roof sign.

Mr. Hudnut asked, "Couldn't we reverse ourselves and approve this instead of approving this (indicating)?"

Mr. Hunter replied, "It is their trade-mark, gentlemen, and I don't know how they would feel about losing that trade-mark on the corner. They did make a major change in the design, putting this little finial on top instead of the tower."

Mr. Hudnut felt the sign over the cornice would not be nearly as offensive as the one now proposed.

Mr. Hunter remarked that the sign over the cornice would not have as much advertising value. "It is back pretty far from the road."

Mr. Belluschi asked if it would be proper to have the architects redesign the sign, simplify it and resubmit it.

Mr. Neild said he would second such a motion.

Mr. Finley suggested that they consider the signs at Williamsburg, and Mr. deWeldon remarked, "It should be a well proportioned sign and not so offensive."

Commenting further, Mr. Belluschi said, "I agree with Mr. Hudnut that the sign on the building is far less offensive, but it means a reversal of the Commission's action.

Chairman Finley said, "I think the Commission, when the sign came up before, was not enthusiastic about the sign or anything about it. We would be glad to have anything that would minimize the effect on the Parkway. If we could get a better appearance by having the sign on the building, I think all of us would be very happy."

Mr. Hudnut answered by saying, "There is an issue beyond that, of a good or a bad sign. It isn't only defending the public against offensive signs, but defending the parks. Of course, I am quite belligerent for a new member but I would like to turn it down flat. I would like to say, 'No, you can't have it.'"

Chairman Finley agreed that the parks should not be defaced by horrible signs, and suggested adopting the motion that has been made so as to get a sign less offensive than this one.

Accordingly, the motion heretofore made by Mr. Belluschi which was seconded by Mr. Neild, that the architects re-design the sign, simplify it and resubmit it, was adopted by the Commission.

Thereupon, Mr. Hunter brought up the question of flood-lighting the building; and Chairman Finley asked for an expression of opinion on the subject.

Mr. deWeldon said, "If it is an attractive building it is good to have it flood-lighted. If it is not, it is better to keep it in the dark."

Chairman Finley asked Mr. Hudnut how he felt about the matter, and Mr. Hudnut replied, "I think it is not too bad."

Mr. Murphy remarked that in some cases it is advantageous to have a flood-light.

Thereupon, Mr. Finley said, "I take it the Commission has no objection to flood-lighting the building."

7. FRANCIS SCOTT KEY MEMORIAL FLAGPOLE: Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Assistant Superintendent, National Capital Parks, National Park Service, submitted a design for the Francis Scott Key Memorial Flagpole, to be erected on the site of the house in which Francis Scott Key lived, on M Street in Georgetown, and to mark the spot, which is on the west side of the Francis Scott Key Bridge. The removal of the house was made necessary by an approach to the bridge nearby of the "Whitehurst Freeway." The house was in a dilapidated condition, but fully half of the material has been saved, and the Columbia Historical Society has plans for its re-erection on the east side of the bridge, subject to the approval of Congress.

Mr. Thompson pointed out that the ground for the flagpole is very small, measuring only 30 by 4 feet. It should be as simple as possible, so that people would not be attracted to it, since it is dangerous to cross the street. It is proposed to use a flag with 15 stars, similar to the Fort McHenry Flag.

Mr. deWeldon said that flag, which is in the Smithsonian, measures 30 by 40 feet.

Mr. Thompson replied it would have to be smaller.

Commenting on the design, Mr. Hudnut said:

"I think it is a great mistake to mark up every little piece of land that happens to be left over, put in bushes, flagpoles and so on. This is a puny little thing that does not really honor the poet very much. I think if you are going to do it, do it without all this fuss and detail. Just put the flagpole down and let it stand there as a flagpole. I am against memorials anyway."

Mr. Hudnut suggested, "Take the money and rebuild the house,"

Mr. Thompson replied that it would cost \$100,000 to rebuild the house; the sum of \$15,000 has been made available for the flagpole.

Then Mr. Hudnut suggested simply using grass or gravel so as to require no maintenance and a simple flagpole. He recommended a restudy of the design with a view to simplification and in this Mr. Belluschi, Mr. Neild and Mr. Murphy concurred.

8. MEMORIAL TO MOHANDAS K. GANDHI: Under date of July 10, 1950, the following letter was received from Mr. J. J. Singh, President of the India League of America, 40 East 49th Street, New York, N. Y.:

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I am writing this letter in connection with my letter of May 23 to Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, and your answer of May 31.

I understand from your letter that the question of considering another location for the proposed Memorial to Mahatma Gandhi was to be taken up at your meeting scheduled for the latter part of June. May I ask if this question was taken up and, if so, what action was taken?

You will realize that all our plans with regard to raising public funds for this Memorial have to be kept in abeyance until the question of the site has been settled.

Therefore, it is but natural that we are anxious to hear from you.

Yours very truly,

Sgd.

J. J. Singh

The Secretary stated that he had informed Mr. Singh that the Commission of Fine Arts was meeting in Washington on July 20th, when the subject of the Mohandas K. Gandhi Memorial would be considered and that he would be informed of the action taken.

The Board's attention is directed to the fact that the Board has not yet received the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934. The Board of Directors is requested to submit the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934 to the Board of Directors as soon as possible. The Board of Directors is requested to submit the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934 to the Board of Directors as soon as possible.

The Board of Directors is requested to submit the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934 to the Board of Directors as soon as possible. The Board of Directors is requested to submit the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934 to the Board of Directors as soon as possible.

The Board of Directors is requested to submit the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934 to the Board of Directors as soon as possible. The Board of Directors is requested to submit the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934 to the Board of Directors as soon as possible.

The Board of Directors is requested to submit the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934 to the Board of Directors as soon as possible. The Board of Directors is requested to submit the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1934 to the Board of Directors as soon as possible.

The Secretary stated that he had supplied each member with a copy of correspondence relating to previous action of the Commission in this matter, as well as a copy of the Act of Congress (Exhibit E), authorizing the erection of the Memorial in Washington. Also, he stated that the site heretofore suggested near Rock Creek Park, adjacent to the India Embassy at Klinge Road, was found to be too small.

The Secretary then pointed out, on a District of Columbia Highway map, three other locations suggested by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Office of National Capital Parks, National Park Service:

(a) Barnard Hill Park, near the intersection of Eastern Avenue and Bunker Hill Road, N.E. (north of Soldiers Home)

In company with Mr. John Nolen of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and Mr. Thompson of the Office of National Capital Parks, the Commission inspected this location during the afternoon. It is a large park area covering about 20 acres, from which 5 acres, the amount of land desired by Mr. Singh, could be made available. He proposed a memorial building, to contain an auditorium, library and museum, with a well developed garden. The Commission felt that, while the grounds might be suitable the location is too remote from the center of Washington.

(b) Near Fort Totten, adjacent to Fort Totten Drive, between Gallatin and Hamilton Streets, N. W.

The Commission inspected the location, but considered it to be too remote from the center of Washington.

(c) Site along the Fort Drive, near Fort Totten. This location is in a residential area, and was not thought to be suitable.

Thereupon, in accordance with a suggestion of Mr. Nolen, the Commission visited East Capitol Street and inspected a location that could be made available between the Capitol and Lincoln Park, by taking two squares on either side of the street, comprising about four acres, and where the Memorial could be located in accordance with the approved Plan of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the National Commission of Fine Arts for the development of East Capitol Street. The Folger Library sets the standard for monumental buildings on that street.

The Secretary stated that Mr. Singh told the Commission of Fine Arts months ago that the India League of America is ready to raise \$10,000,000 for the Memorial, but ask that the United States Government give the site. The question of the Government buying two squares for the Memorial, if the India League of America should decide on the location, is one that would, after approval by these two Commissions, have to meet the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library and the Congress.

The Commission of Fine Arts were well impressed with the East Capitol Street location. Mr. Hudnut remarked that there the Memorial would be in the cultural center of Washington near the Library of Congress and museums. The Commission concurred with Mr. Hudnut in this matter, and a report was sent to Mr. Singh accordingly. (Exhibit F).

9. ADVERTISING SIGN FOR HOWARD JOHNSON RESTAURANT, No. 1, Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.: The Secretary stated that the design for this building ~~of~~ was approved by the Commission of Fine Arts at the May meeting. The question of sign was held in abeyance. The design submitted, it will be observed, is a duplicate of the one proposed for the parkway.

Chairman Finley asked, "Shall we make the same recommendations"

Mr. Hudnut Replied, "I believe we should."

The Commission disapproved the design accordingly.

10. GASOLINE SERVICE STATION, 28th and M Streets, at the intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.: The Secretary presented the design for a Lord Baltimore Gasoline Service Station to be built at this location, replacing a building used as a church and more recently as a Boys' Club.

It was noted that the designer had made an attempt to design the building in the colonial style, but had failed miserably. Mr. Hudnut said he would refuse to buy his gasoline in such a building.

Mr. Murphy called attention to the hideous character of commercial buildings in the locality, and suggested that they get a good architect to design the building. "These oil companies," he said, "have employees who are frequently draftsmen and sometimes architects and they may get a plan without referring to a registered architect. If it was indicated that a registered architect could take over and cooperate with the Commission, and in the interests of the Georgetown development, just to the West, it would be advisable."

Mr. Hudnut remarked, "Do you not think it is a mistake to refer to the architects? I would simply say the design is not good enough and that it will require a higher standard for this location."

Mr. Murphy replied, "We can leave the legislation about the architects to the people working with it. In any event we want a better design."

In conclusion, Chairman Finley stated, "I believe the concensus of opinion is that it should be restudied and a better design submitted." A report was sent to the American Oil Company accordingly (Exhibit G).

11. STATUE OF SIMON BOLIVAR: The Secretary called attention to an Act of Congress (Public Law 157, approved July 5, 1949, (Exhibit H) under which Venezuela is permitted to erect a statue of General Simon Bolivar, great South American Liberator, on public ground in the District of Columbia.

1. The first step in the process of the investigation is to determine the scope of the problem.

2. The next step is to identify the causes of the problem. This is done by conducting a thorough investigation of the situation. The investigation should be conducted in a systematic and objective manner. The causes of the problem should be identified by examining the evidence and by consulting with the people involved in the situation.

3. The third step is to develop a plan of action. This plan should be based on the causes of the problem and should be designed to eliminate the causes. The plan should be developed in a systematic and objective manner. The plan should be based on the evidence and should be designed to eliminate the causes of the problem.

4. The fourth step is to implement the plan of action. This is done by carrying out the plan in a systematic and objective manner. The plan should be implemented in a systematic and objective manner. The plan should be based on the evidence and should be designed to eliminate the causes of the problem.

5. The fifth step is to evaluate the results of the investigation. This is done by comparing the results of the investigation with the original problem. The results should be evaluated in a systematic and objective manner. The results should be based on the evidence and should be designed to eliminate the causes of the problem.

6. The sixth step is to report the results of the investigation. This is done by preparing a report that describes the results of the investigation. The report should be prepared in a systematic and objective manner. The report should be based on the evidence and should be designed to eliminate the causes of the problem.

7. The seventh step is to follow up on the results of the investigation. This is done by monitoring the situation to ensure that the causes of the problem have been eliminated. The follow-up should be conducted in a systematic and objective manner. The follow-up should be based on the evidence and should be designed to eliminate the causes of the problem.

8. The eighth step is to conclude the investigation. This is done by summarizing the results of the investigation and by making recommendations for the future. The conclusion should be based on the evidence and should be designed to eliminate the causes of the problem.

9. The ninth step is to disseminate the results of the investigation. This is done by sharing the results of the investigation with the people involved in the situation. The dissemination should be conducted in a systematic and objective manner. The dissemination should be based on the evidence and should be designed to eliminate the causes of the problem.

Dr. John M. C. Crane, of Washington, is acting as Liaison Officer in this matter. The site suggested is a triangle in front of this Interior Department Building. Dr. Crane prefers this location since the statue would then be near the Pan American Union.

The Commission took the matter under advisement, and decided to inspect the site during the day.

Mr. Hudnut said:

"I think the practice of putting memorials in a whirl of traffic is fundamentally wrong. A memorial should be placed in a park or in a quiet area. One of the great troubles with the city of Washington is the fact that you have so many monuments and fountains that have been placed in a little triangle that is left by the designer, who was very fond of that sort of thing. There is no quietude, peace or background to it. It ought to be our policy to place such things in quiet settings in a park area."

The Secretary remarked it is a problem and that he merely mentioned this project because it is coming before the Commission shortly. "As I understand it, Venezuela has already appropriated the money, something like \$100,000."

Mr. Hudnut suggested a conference with Dr. Crane, ~~and~~ "Perhaps it would be possible to discuss it with him and bring out our objections to it."

Mr. Neild asked if all of those little triangles are used up.

The Secretary replied:

"Most of them. In the old days, that is about a hundred years ago, they used them for garbage heaps. Then some twenty years later, during the Governor Shepherd Regime, it was decided it would be a good idea to plant a few trees on them and some grass.

Later on in the '90's several of the Civil War veterans' organizations chose a number of the triangles and erected monuments on them. When the Commission of Fine Arts was established in 1910 the Commission began to consider other locations, away from the center of the city. For instance, one of the first was a monument to the poet Longfellow, on Connecticut Avenue at M Street. It happened to be that the ground was in the form of a triangle, but it was away from the downtown section of the city. In those days, Connecticut Avenue was a residential street. That was 40 years ago.

There are always bills introduced in Congress for monuments and this Commission is empowered by law in the matter of location. It requires an Act of Congress to permit any organization or individual to erect a monument on public grounds in the District of Columbia. Recently a "safety clause" has been added to legislation, to the effect, for instance, that 'unless the erection of this statue is begun within five years from and after the date of passage of this joint resolution, the authorization hereby granted is revoked,' with a further proviso that the Secretary of the Interior, who has charge of parks and reservations in the District of Columbia, must have assurance that sufficient funds are in hand to carry out a proposed project."

12 H. R. 7670 TO PROTECT HISTORIC GEORGETOWN: Chairman Finley ~~asked~~ asked the Secretary to explain this legislation pending in Congress.

Mr. Caemmerer replied:

"I referred to the legislation briefly in Item 3 concerning the Budget and additional personnel, and each member of the Commission has a copy of the Act as it passed the House of Representatives on July 13, 1950. It is now pending in the Senate for action."

"On the Highway Map here, I have outlined the area as outlined in the Act. It extends along the Rock Creek Parkway north to Dumbarton Oaks Park, then westward to the Archbold Parkway and Reservoir Road thence southward to the Potomac and eastward along the river to the Parkway."

"There are about 300 residences in that area that were built fully one hundred years ago or more. The legislation ~~pro~~ provides that --

Under this Act, assuming that the Senate will approve it and also the President, there is to be a Board of three architects, appointed by the Commission of Fine Arts to advise on the designs that will be submitted by the Office of the Inspector of Buildings -- Director of Inspection is his official title. The Board must report to the Commission of Fine Arts in writing. Within 45 days the Commission must report to the Director of Inspection, or else he may assume that the design has been approved.

"I hope in the latter part of the afternoon there will be time to see some of the historic buildings in Georgetown. They are very interesting, and of course are of the colonial period and the post-colonial period. Georgetown will observe in 1951 their Bicentennial. The purpose of the Act is to protect them, as do similar Ordinances in New Orleans, Charleston (S.C.) and Alexandria." I have heard that in the past year there were about 100 submissions to the City Council in Alexandria of designs coming under their Ordinance."

Chairman Finley then said, "That is the reason for Section 3, authorizing this Commission 'to appoint a committee of three architects which will serve as a Board of Review without expense to the United States and who shall advise the Commission of Fine Arts, in writing, regarding designs and plans referred to it.'"

"We thought that if all that work was thrown to this Commission, we could not possibly cope with it, as we are scattered and everyone here is busy and has his own work and the staff is very small. Therefore, that was written into the Bill. This proposed Act was shown to the Commission and we suggested that something of this sort be done. This authorizes us to appoint a committee. I suppose one year at a time, each year?" (It was noted that no time is specified). I would think we would take some reasonable length of time. Of course, it should be an honor to the architects who serve on it; but on the other hand it will be quite a lot of work and they will do that without remuneration.

The Secretary stated, "Assuming this legislation will become law within 30 days, then we may expect designs sent to this Commission. Now who shall be appointed on that Board of Architects?"

Chairman Finley said, "I believe it would be a good idea if everyone would think that over and send in some names. You are acquainted with architects in Washington."

Mr. deWeldon suggested Mr. McComber "who was one of the chief architects of Williamsburg and at Mount Vernon, too. He lives somewhere between Mount Vernon and Washington."

Mr. Murphy mentioned Roy Hoffman and Fred Brooks, who lives in Georgetown.

Mr. Hudnut remarked that it would be a very strenuous job. "I think if we get three good men who live in Georgetown, it would be a way out, — architects who really cared about the town."

13. PORTRAIT OF MRS. GROVER CLEVELAND: During the afternoon, at the National Gallery of Art, the Commission inspected a portrait of Mrs. Grover Cleveland by Gregory Stepko (being a copy of an original by Zorn

1. The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the plane was the cold, crisp air. It felt like a blanket after a long, hot summer. The ground below was a mix of brown and green, with patches of snow here and there. The sky was a pale blue, with a few wispy clouds scattered across it. I took a deep breath and felt a sense of peace wash over me. It was a beautiful sight, and I knew I was in for a great trip.
2. The second thing I noticed was the sound of the engine. It was a low, steady hum that filled the cabin. I looked around and saw everyone else looking out the windows. The flight attendant smiled at me and said, "Welcome aboard. We hope you have a pleasant flight." I nodded and smiled back. It was a nice touch, and I felt welcomed.
3. The third thing I noticed was the smell of the cabin. It was a mix of the cold air outside and the warm, slightly stale air inside. I closed my eyes and took a deep breath. It was a familiar smell, and it made me feel at home. I knew I was going to have a good time on this trip.
4. The fourth thing I noticed was the view from the window. The landscape below was a mix of rolling hills and valleys. The hills were covered in a mix of green grass and brown earth. The valleys were filled with a mix of trees and fields. It was a beautiful sight, and I knew I was in for a great trip.
5. The fifth thing I noticed was the sound of the music. It was a soft, melodic tune that filled the cabin. I looked around and saw everyone else looking at the music player. The flight attendant smiled at me and said, "We hope you like the music. It's a mix of classic and contemporary hits." I nodded and smiled back. It was a nice touch, and I felt welcomed.
6. The sixth thing I noticed was the taste of the food. It was a mix of delicious and healthy. I looked around and saw everyone else looking at the food tray. The flight attendant smiled at me and said, "We hope you like the food. It's a mix of classic and contemporary dishes." I nodded and smiled back. It was a nice touch, and I felt welcomed.
7. The seventh thing I noticed was the feel of the blanket. It was a soft, warm blanket that I had brought with me. I looked around and saw everyone else looking at the blanket. The flight attendant smiled at me and said, "We hope you like the blanket. It's a mix of classic and contemporary colors." I nodded and smiled back. It was a nice touch, and I felt welcomed.
8. The eighth thing I noticed was the sound of the engine. It was a low, steady hum that filled the cabin. I looked around and saw everyone else looking out the windows. The flight attendant smiled at me and said, "Welcome aboard. We hope you have a pleasant flight." I nodded and smiled back. It was a nice touch, and I felt welcomed.
9. The ninth thing I noticed was the smell of the cabin. It was a mix of the cold air outside and the warm, slightly stale air inside. I closed my eyes and took a deep breath. It was a familiar smell, and it made me feel at home. I knew I was going to have a good time on this trip.
10. The tenth thing I noticed was the view from the window. The landscape below was a mix of rolling hills and valleys. The hills were covered in a mix of green grass and brown earth. The valleys were filled with a mix of trees and fields. It was a beautiful sight, and I knew I was in for a great trip.

which is on exhibition at the Gallery) which the League of American Penwomen propose to give to the White House. The Commission regarded it as "a faithful copy" and approved it (Exhibit I)

14. EXHIBITION OF PORTRAITS — MAKERS OF HISTORY: Mr. Finley, as Director of the National Gallery of Art, had pleasure in showing the Commission this Exhibition of Portraits. The Commission enjoyed seeing the portraits. Mr. Finley said the Exhibition indicates there is need of a Portrait Gallery in Washington, and in this the Commission concurred. The Sesquicentennial Commission provided funds for the Exhibition.

15. EXHIBITION ON THE PLAN OF WASHINGTON; Corcoran Gallery of Art: The Commission visited the Corcoran Gallery of Art to see the Exhibition on the Plan of Washington, Past, Present, and Future. The Commission enjoyed seeing the pictures designs and models on exhibition. The Commission noted from the model showing the proposed East Capitol Street development the location proposed for the Memorial to Mohandas K. Gandhi.

16. EXHIBITION ENTITLED AMERICAN PROCESSIONAL (1492-1900): Director Hermann W. Williams of the Corcoran Gallery of Art invited the Commission to see the Exhibition - on the second floor of the Gallery. Several of the members availed themselves of the opportunity. The Exhibition will continue to the middle of December. This Exhibition and the one on the Plan of Washington were made possible through funds made available by the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.

The Commission were the guests of Director Finley of the National Gallery of Art, at luncheon. The Commission adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Calendar No. 2118

81ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7670

[Report No. 2115]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 19 (legislative day, JULY 1), 1950

Read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

JULY 21 (legislative day, JULY 20), 1950

Reported by Mr. LEAHY, without amendment

AN ACT

To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That there is hereby created in the District of Columbia a
4 district known as "Old Georgetown" which is bounded on
5 the east by Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway from the
6 Potomac River to the north boundary of Dumbarton Oaks
7 Park, on the north by the north boundary of Dumbarton
8 Oaks Park, Whitehaven Street and Whitehaven Parkway to
9 Thirty-fifth Street, south along the middle of Thirty-fifth
10 Street to Reservoir Road, west along the middle of Reservoir

AN ACT

To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital.

JULY 14 (legislative day, JULY 1), 1950

Read twice and referred to the Committee on the
District of Columbia

JULY 21 (legislative day, JULY 20), 1950

Reported without amendment

July 25, 1950

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 20, 1950, considered your design for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters headquarters building, to be located at D Street and Louisiana Avenue, N. W., near Union Station Plaza.

The Commission took note of the importance of the location, and felt that the design should, therefore, receive further study, particularly the facade facing Louisiana Avenue. The Commission did not like the so-called "projection." The Commission would prefer a plain facade, similar to that on D Street.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Messrs. Holabird & Root & Burgee, Architects,
180 North Wabash Avenue,
Chicago, Illinois.

Exhibit B

C O P Y

KASS REALTY COMPANY, INC.
4461 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Washington 8, D. C.

Garfield I. Kass
President

EMerson 8100

July 17, 1950

Fine Arts Commission
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

Attention: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith are two sets of blueprints and rendered ~~prospective~~ for proposed apartment building at 25th and E Streets, N. W., and request that this be given consideration at the Commission's meeting on July 20, 1950.

In accordance with your suggestion, Mr. Brock of my office, contacted Mr. A. S. Thorne, Supervising Architect, to ascertain any proposed development at this time that his office might have for this property.

Mr. Thorne advised that at the present time there are no public funds available for the development of this particular area, nor are there any Acts or any Bills pending in Congress for the appropriation of any monies to purchase ground in this immediate vicinity and no immediate prospects of any such action being taken.

I, therefore, request that the design as submitted be approved by the Commission in order that we may proceed with the construction of this building.

Very truly yours,

Sgd.

Garfield I. Kass

GIK:GSB:ls

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

July 25, 1950

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 20, 1950, considered your design for a commercial building at Twenty-first Street and Virginia Avenue, Northwest. It was considered particularly in its relation to the State Department building, across the Avenue.

The Commission disapproved the design. The Commission felt the design lacks dignity, and therefore should be given further study.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley
Chairman.

Kass Realty Company, Inc.
4461 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT D

[PUBLIC LAW 309—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 587—1ST SESSION]

[H. J. Res. 295]

JOINT RESOLUTION

To erect a memorial to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi.

Whereas India's greatest leader, Mohandas K. Gandhi, has met the martyr's death; and

Whereas the beloved Gandhi throughout his life had brought to the people of India and peoples everywhere the meaning of a selfless devotion to peace, and with it the gift of his own unbounded spiritual wealth; and

Whereas Mohandas Gandhi's uncompromisable strength led India to the independence for which it had sorely struggled; and

Whereas the impact of his personality upon history is undeniable; and

Whereas in consideration of the cordial relations existing between the people of the United States and the people of India, and in the hope that a memorial to his memory in the United States may further those cordial cultural and spiritual relations between these two countries, and in the further hope that such a memorial will awaken and keep alive in people everywhere the sense of their individual dignity and independence as well as an abhorrence for civil, religious, and communal strife anywhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That authority is hereby granted to the India League of America, or any other organization which may be organized for this purpose, to erect, within five years from the date of the approval of this resolution, a memorial testifying to the wisdom and leadership of Mohandas K. Gandhi, as philosopher and statesman, in the city of Washington, on such grounds as may be designated by the Fine Arts Commission, subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library. The model of the memorial so to be erected shall be first approved by the said Commission and by the Joint Committee on the Library, the same to be presented to the people of the United States without cost to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That the cost of custodian maintenance of the edifice contemplated by this Act will be borne perpetually by the organization undertaking its original construction.

Approved September 28, 1949.

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA

40 East 49th Street

New York 17, N.Y.

July 10, 1930.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary
The Fine Arts Commission
Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I am writing this letter in connection with my letter of May 23 to Mr. Gilmore S. Clarke, and your answer of May 31.

I understood from your letter that the question of considering another location for the proposed Memorial to Mahatma Gandhi was to be taken up at your meeting scheduled for the latter part of June. May I ask if this question was taken up and, if so, what action was taken?

You will realize that all our plans with regard to raising public funds for this Memorial have to be kept in abeyance until the question of the site has been settled.

Therefore, it is but natural that we are anxious to hear from you.

Yours very truly,

J.S. Singh (signed)

COPY

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Washington

February 17, 1960.

Mr. H. P. Cammerer,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington 25, D.C.

Subject: Proposed Gandhi Memorial in Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

In accordance with the request made in your letter of December 21, 1949, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission considered at its meeting on January 25, 1950, the matter of a site for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial in Washington, D. C., as authorized by Public Law 309, 81st Congress, approved September 28, 1949.

It is apparent from the letter signed by the Assistant to the Attorney General to Congressman Emanuel Celler, a copy of which you attached, that authority for the erection of the memorial extends to the use of such public land as may be designated by the Commission of Fine Arts and approved by the Joint Committee on the Library. This, of course, narrows greatly the selection of a suitable site of as much as five acres in extent. However, there is apparently nothing in the resolution that would require the use of public land if there were substantial reasons for selecting a privately-owned site more fully adapted and worthy of the purpose.

In the original city of Washington there are no unallocated public reservations of sufficient size for this memorial and the Commission would be opposed to the use of any of the park areas in this section of the city. These areas are all at a premium as open spaces, and a dangerous precedent would be established if any one of them were allocated for memorial buildings. In its place, however, the Commission has recognized the need for additional, centrally located sites for just such purposes as the Gandhi Memorial, as will be noted below. Such sites are not now in public ownership.

If it is assumed that availability of public land is more important than a prime central location, the Commission recommends as site in Barnard Hill Park, near the intersection of Eastern Avenue and Bunker Hill Road, N.E. Here ample land is available without greatly impairing park development and use.

There are three additional sites, partly on park property, which could be supplemented and made adequate by relatively small and inexpensive land acquisitions, as follows:

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- (1) Between Klinge Road and Porter Streets, N.E., adjoining the India Embassy.

Here 1.8 acres of park property could be enlarged to the required 3 acres by the addition of 2 acres of the embassy property and the acquisition of 1.8 acres contained in Lot 803, Square 2216, assessed at \$17,100.

- (2) Along the Port Drive, in the vicinity of Hamilton Street and South Dakota Avenue, N.E.

As only a limited strip of park property could be used, it will be necessary to acquire about 3 acres of Parcel 137/32, assessed at \$11,000.

- (3) Near Fort Totten, adjacent to Fort Totten Drive, between Callatin and Hamilton Streets, N.E.

Here 1.9 acres of U.S. property is available, which would need to be supplemented by an acquisition of about 3.2 acres from Parcel 124/107 adjoining, assessed at \$8,800.

The general locations of these sites are shown on the enclosed map.

The Commission has directed me to ask the Commission of Fine Arts to urge the India League of America to consider a site in the East Capitol Street area, in accordance with the plan jointly approved some years ago by both the Fine Arts and the Planning Commissions. You will recall that it was for just such purposes as the Gandhi Memorial that the East Capitol Street plan was designed. We mentioned that in our report to the House Committee considering the Gandhi Memorial Bill in 1948. A copy of General Grant's letter, which was also sent to Congressman Callar and to the president of the India League of America, is enclosed. There is also enclosed a small print of the East Capitol Street plan.

The Commission will be glad to advise further with your Commission and with the representatives of the India League of America, if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

A. E. JENKINS,

Acting Executive Officer.

Enclosures
JM 1c

COPY
National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Washington

June 15, 1948.

Hon. C. W. Bishop, Chairman,
Subcommittee of the Committee
on House Administration,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

Subject: H.R. 460, Memorial to Gandhi.

My dear Mr. Bishop:

At the request of Congressman Emanuel Celler, I am writing you about House Resolution 460, which provides for a memorial to Gandhi. I have also received a letter from the President of the India League of America outlining this proposal in more detail and similarly requesting that I write you.

Unfortunately, there has not been an opportunity to get this matter before the Commission for any formal action nor to clear a report on this legislation with the Bureau of the Budget. However, in view of Congressman Celler's desire for an early report, I am expressing the following opinions.

We do not know of any site in public ownership which would be of sufficient size and otherwise suitable for construction of a commemorative hall with appropriate landscape surroundings. However, we have provided on our proposed plan for the development of East Capitol Street a number of sites that would be ideally suited for this purpose. They are indicated on the enclosed copy of the Commission's plan for the Central Area. None of these sites is in public ownership and thus provision would have to be made for their acquisition.

As an alternative to this suggestion, there is a site of outstanding prominence adjacent to the Government of India Embassy between Klinge Road and Porter Streets on high ground overlooking Rock Creek Park and clearly visible from the new Klinge Road-Porter Street bridge. While it is not in public ownership, it probably could be acquired at a relatively small cost compared to one in the central area. It is, however, not very accessible for an auditorium seating as many as 600 persons.

There are, of course, other outlying sites which might be considered and I would be glad to discuss these possibilities with you at your convenience. However, it seems to me that a site conceived as a part of the East Capitol Street plan would be ideal as it was just this kind of activity which we had in mind to accommodate when the plan was developed. It would further the expansion of a cultural center eastward from the Library of Congress.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Celler at his request and also to the President of the India League of America.

Sincerely yours,

U.S. Grant, 3rd,
Major General, U.S.A. Ret.,
Chairman.

Enclosure

cc: Congressman Emanuel Celler,

J.J. Singh, President,
India League of America,
40 East 49th Street,
New York 17, N.Y.

JH:wan

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

J. J. SINGH, President
D. J. WALSH,
man Executive Committee
FISCHER, Vice-President
HOLMES SMITH, Vice-President
DRA K. RAKHIT, Secretary
N. BALDWIN, Treasurer
T. J. DE VARCO, Counselor
REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER
HERTZBERG
HY NORMAN
SEPHINE RATHBONE
HABIB RAWJEE
RNA
A. D. WADIA
WHITE

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA

40 EAST 49th STREET

NEW YORK 17, N. Y.



ADVISORY BOARD:

ADAMIC
d, N. J.
BROMFIELD
Ohio
YCK BROOKS
ort, Conn.
HENRY CARPENTER
yn, N. Y.
R. CHANNON
ancisco, Cal.
N. CHATTERJEE
Springs, Ohio
H. L. CHILDS
ork, N. Y.
SOR LEWIS COREY
Springs, Ohio
IDSON
ork, N. Y.
DELSON
York, N. Y.
HILLON
ytro, Cal.
SOR ALBERT EINSTEIN
lon, N. J.
HY CANFIELD FISHER
ton, Vi.
REPRESENTATIVE JAMES G. FULTON
urgh, Pa.
P. GRAHAM
I Hill, N. Carolina
ES GUNTHER
on, Conn.
GARFIELD HAYS
ork, N. Y.
SOR WILLIAM E. HOCKING
ridge, Mass.
IN HAYNES HOLMES
ork, N. Y.
TANLEY JONES
ork, N. Y.
OUIS JOHNSON
gton, D. C.
MED I. KITCHLEW
go, Ill.
IN H. LATHROP
yn, N. Y.
R. LUCE
ork, N. Y.
LA MUKERJI
rgh, Pa.
REPRESENTATIVE KARL E. MUNDT
on, So. Dakota
MURRAY
gton, D. C.
IDAS T. MUZUMDAR
agaz, N. Mexico
FRANCIS J. McCONNELL
ork, N. Y.
A McCORMICK
ork, N. Y.
ran PAASSEN
ork, N. Y.
S. PATTON
Col.
A. PHILLIPS
Beverly, Mass.
FORD PINCHOT
gton, D. C.
G. REUTHER
Mich.
P. REUTHER
Michigan
SHEAN
ork, N. Y.
I. L. SHIRER
ork, N. Y.
STOWE
ork, N. Y.
S. SUNGA
California
THOMAS
ork, N. Y.
GARRISON VILLARD
ork, N. Y.
MES P. WARBURG
ork, N. Y.
AX WEIS
ork, N. Y.
E WESTON
Meine
WILLEN
ork, N. Y.

December 12, 1949

Mr. Gilmore E. Clarke, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

You will recall that I had the pleasure of
appearing before your Committee on November
10, in connection with the Mahatma Gandhi
Memorial in Washington, D. C.

At this meeting, you told me that according
to Public Law 209, you will have to have a
ruling from the Attorney General of the
United States before any public land could
be allotted for this memorial.

I conveyed this message to Representative
Emanuel Celler, the author of the Bill, and
the same day a letter was addressed to
Honorable Howard J. McGrath, Attorney General
of the United States. A copy of that letter
is enclosed for easy reference.

I have today received a letter from Repre-
sentative Emanuel Celler with a copy of a
letter to him from the Department of Justice.
A copy of the letter from the Department of
Justice is enclosed herewith.

According to this letter, the Attorney
General has interpreted Public Law 209 to
mean that public land is to be used for the
Mahatma Gandhi Memorial.

We are very happy to have this interpretation from the Department of Justice because the intent and purpose of the resolution was that public land should be granted for this memorial.

I do hope, sir, that your Commission will take up this matter at its earliest opportunity and allot a suitable area of about five acres for this memorial.

I shall be very happy to come to Washington for further discussion of this matter at any time convenient to you.

Yours very truly,

J. J. King, President

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Washington, D. C.

December 5, 1949

Honorable Emanuel Celler
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in further response to your letter of November 10, 1949, to the Attorney General, requesting an opinion as to whether Public Law 409 of the 81st Congress, which provides for the erection of a memorial to Mohandas K. Gandhi, authorizes the use of public land for the purpose of erecting such a memorial.

That Act provides, in part, that the memorial is to be erected "in the city of Washington, on such grounds as may be designated by the Fine Arts Commission, subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library. The model of the memorial so to be erected shall be first approved by the said Commission and by the Joint Committee on the Library, the same to be presented to the people of the United States without cost to the Government of the United States."

The Fine Arts Commission is vested with authority to advise upon the location of statues, fountains, and monuments in the public squares, streets, and parks in the District of Columbia, 40 U.S.C. 104. The Joint Committee on the Library is composed of the Chairman and four members of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Chairman and four members of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, 40 U.S.C. 102b. Its duties relate primarily to the library and such other duties as may be conferred by law. There is nothing in the above-cited sections to indicate that either the Fine Arts Commission or the Committee on the Library has any peculiar duties in relation to securing sites in the District of Columbia.

Under the language of Public Law 70, it appears that the site for the proposed memorial is to be designated by the Fine Arts Commission which has authority to advise on the location of monuments in the public squares, streets and parks in the District. In view of the fact that the powers of the Commission are not enlarged for the purpose of this Act, and since the Commission has no concurrent authority over private property, it would seem that the site must necessarily be on public land in one of these areas which come under the purview of the Commission's jurisdiction.

The Act provides that the memorial is to be constructed by the India League of America, or by any other organization that might be organized for that purpose, and donated to the United States. There is no authority in the Act to divest the United States of title to the land to be chosen for the site, but there does appear to be authority to dedicate a tract of public land to be used for the memorial and an acceptance by the United States of the memorial when constructed.

Yours sincerely,

Dayton Ford
The Assistant to the Attorney General

C O P Y

November 10, 1949

Honorable Howard J. McGrath
Attorney General of the United States
Department of Justice
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Howard:

I am enclosing a copy of Public Law 809, (House Joint Resolution 295), to erect a memorial to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi. This is a resolution which I offered and piloted through both Houses of Congress.

With regard to Public Law 809, the question is raised by the Fine Arts Commission, as to whether the land on which the memorial is to be erected shall be public land, donated for such purposes by the Federal Government.

I can say that this was my intention as sponsor of the resolution, the intention of those who spoke for the resolution, and the intention of all the supporters of this legislation. In conferences with members of the Fine Arts Commission, this intention was expressed and understood.

The India League of America is now endeavoring to work out details concerning funds for the erection of the memorial. I am a member of the Board of the India League of America, along with Pearl Buck, Richard Walsh, Senator Frank E. Graham, Reverend John Haynes Holmes, etc. We would like to have this question adjusted, and for that purpose, it may be necessary that you write a letter to me stating that the intention of the resolution was that public land be used for the purposes of erecting the memorial.

The Fine Arts Commission is most anxious that such a letter be written, and I am, therefore, eager to have you address such a letter to me as soon as possible.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CULLER

July 25, 1950

Dear Mr. Singh:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 20, 1950, devoted a good part of the day to the problem of finding a suitable location for the proposed Memorial to Mohandas K. Gandhi, in accordance with the Act of Congress, approved on September 28, 1949.

As heretofore reported, in the original City of Washington (that is, the portion comprising the L'Enfant Plan of 1791) there are no public reservations of sufficient size as desired by your Committee, about five (5) acres, available, and the use of park land and playground area is prohibitive.

The Commission took note of the fact that your Committee found a suggested location, near the India Embassy, to be too small. Therefore, the Commission visited several other suggested locations where about five acres of public land could be made available, though these are far out near the District of Columbia Boundary line, namely:

- (a) Barnard Hill Park, near the intersection of Eastern Avenue and Bunker Hill Road, N. E. (north of Soldiers' Home).
- (b) Near Fort Totten, adjacent to Fort Totten Drive, between Gallatin and Hamilton Streets, N. E.

One other, which, though available, would not be suitable.

We shall be pleased to show you these sites any time you desire to come to Washington to see them.

I regret to add that, in the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts, these sites are so remote that comparatively few visitors to Washington would find it possible to visit the Memorial, if located on one of these sites.

However, there is a site where the Commission feel that the Gandhi Memorial would be well located, namely on East Capitol Street, between the Capitol and Lincoln Park. There it would be placed with other memorials and buildings of a similar nature, in accordance with the Plan of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and of the National Commission of Fine Arts for the aesthetic development of East Capitol Street, making a magnificent approach to the Capitol from the East. The Folger Shakespeare Library sets the standard for monumental buildings in that location. It would be in the literary and cultural center of the City of Washington, not far from the Library of Congress and the museums maintained by the Federal Government.

The Plan for the East Capitol Street development is so arranged that two squares could be made available, on either side of the street, comprising about four acres. This Commission feel that such a site would be large enough for an appropriate memorial building and a suitable garden. It would be necessary to acquire the land by Government purchase, if your organization finds it impossible to acquire it. We have not learned the assessed valuation, but the cost would undoubtedly be quite large. The site would require approval of the Joint Committee on the Library, and, if this approval is secured, the necessary changes in the legislation could be made accordingly.

Should this East Capitol Street location meet with your approval, we would be pleased to pursue the matter further.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. J.J. Singh, President
India League of America
40 East 49th Street
New York, N. Y.

C O P Y

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA

40 East 49th Street

New York 17, N. Y.

28 July 1950

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Mr. Singh left for Europe today for six weeks. Unfortunately, your letter arrived after he had left. But it will be brought to his attention upon his return, September 9.

Sincerely yours,

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Sgd.

(Mrs.) Selma Holm

EXHIBIT F - 1

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington

August 2, 1950

Dear Sirs:

With regard to your design for a Gasoline Service Station at the intersection of M Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, this was considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on July 20, 1950, and disapproved.

The design does not meet the standard which the Commission of Fine Arts is maintaining to preserve and contribute to the historic character of "Old Georgetown." There should be a restudy of the design and a better design submitted to this Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

The American Oil Company
711 Fourteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G

[PUBLIC LAW 157—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 297—1ST SESSION]

[H. J. Res. 240]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a statue of Simon Bolivar.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to grant authority to the Simon Bolivar Memorial Foundation, Washington, District of Columbia, to erect a bronze statue of the liberator, Simon Bolivar, the gift of the Government of Venezuela, including pedestal, on an appropriate site on grounds now owned by the United States in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the design of the statue, including the pedestal, and the site chosen shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this statue and proper landscape treatment of the site, so as to provide a proper setting, including planting, walks, and curbs: *Provided further*, That unless the erection of this statue is begun within five years from and after the date of passage of this joint resolution, the authorization hereby granted is revoked.

Approved July 5, 1949.

EXHIBIT H

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington

July 21, 1950

Dear Mrs. Marvin:

I am pleased to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 20, 1950, inspected the portrait of Mrs. Grover Cleveland, which the Pen Women of America propose to give to the White House, and approved it.

I have talked with Mr. H. G. Crim, Chief Usher of the White House, about this matter, and he has stated that he would appreciate your calling him as to arrangements you may wish to make concerning presentation. He hopes these will be as simple as possible.

Mr. Finley has asked me to tell you that he will gladly keep the portrait with other White House portraits that are being kept at the National Gallery of Art, pending reopening of the White House.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

H. P. Caemmerer,
Secretary.

Mrs. Cloyd Heck Marvin, President,
Pen Women of America,
National Press Club,
Washington, D. C.

